



RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 7 2007  
RiverPark Towers  
333 West San Carlos Street  
Suite 600  
San Jose, CA 95110  
Direct Tel: (408) 975-7994  
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501  
joseph@kenyon.com

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences [Examiner Te Y. CHEN]	FROM:	Jeffrey R. Joseph
COMPANY:	USPTO	DATE:	May 7, 2007
FAX NUMBER:	(571) 273-8300	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:	5 pgs.
PHONE NUMBER:		SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:	Intel 2207/618602
RE:	Serial No.: 10/659,133	YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER:	Group Art Unit: 2161

☐ URGENT ☒ FOR REVIEW ☐ PLEASE COMMENT ☐ PLEASE REPLY ☐ CONFIRMATION  
☐ ORIGINAL WILL FOLLOW ☒ ORIGINAL WILL NOT FOLLOW

Notes/Comments: **REPLY BRIEF**

1. Fax Cover Sheet (1)
  2. Reply Brief (4)
- Total: (5) pages

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION, INCLUDING ANY ATTACHMENTS, IS SUBJECT TO THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE, THE ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT PRIVILEGE OR IS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INTENDED RECIPIENT. IF THE READER OF THIS NOTICE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THIS TRANSMISSION TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, WE HEREBY NOTIFY YOU THAT ANY USE, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF ALL OR PART OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU RECEIVED THIS TRANSMISSION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE (408) 975-7500 OR FACSIMILE (408) 975-7501, SO THAT WE MAY ARRANGE FOR ITS RETURN OR DESTRUCTION AT OUR COST. THANK YOU.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER


Patent

Attorney Docket No.: Intel 2207/618602  
Assignee: Intel Corporation  
MAY - 7 2007

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

APPLICANTS : Per HAMMARLUND et al. CONFIRMATION NO.: 4796  
SERIAL NO. : 10/659,133  
FILING DATE : September 10, 2003  
GROUP ART UNIT : 2161  
FOR : ACCESS CONTROL OF A RESOURCE SHARED BETWEEN  
COMPONENTS  
EXAMINER : Te Y CHEN

M/S: APPEAL BRIEFS - PATENTS  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



**ATTENTION: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

**REPLY BRIEF**

Dear Sir:

This Reply Brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed in this case on March 6, 2007.

Appellants submit this Reply Brief to address issues raised in the Examiner's Answer.

Application No.: 10/659,133  
 Filing Date: September 10, 2003  
 Appellant(s): Per Hammarlund et al.  
 Reply Brief Filed: May 7, 2007

### REMARKS

Claims 2-11, 13, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebrahim et al. (USP 5,644,753) in view of Arimilli et al. (USP 5,867,511). Appellants' independent claim 2 recites in part: "access to the partitioned elements by said first and second components is controlled based on said first mask value . . . ." Examiner cites the following portion of Ebrahim as teaching this element of claim 2:

The first mode of operation is used for all access requests by the data processor and for system controller access requests when the mode flag has a first value. The second mode of operation is used for the system controller access requests when the mode flag has a second value distinct from the first value.

See Ebrahim Abstract. The Examiner, however, fails to provide the portion of the abstract that describes the first and second modes.

The cache controller has two modes of operation, including a first standard mode of operation in which read/write access to the cache memory is preceded by generation of the hit/miss signal by the comparator, and a second accelerated mode of operation in which read/write access to the cache memory is initiated without waiting for the comparator to process the access request's address value.

In Ebrahim, the two modes distinguish between what does or does not happen before accessing the cache. Access is not controlled based on the mode flag.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the mode flag can be viewed as a mask value as claimed by Appellants, Examiner's argument still fails to read Ebrahim onto Appellants' claimed invention. On page 11 of the Examiner's Answer, Examiner asserts that "the system controller and the data processor definitely represent the claimed first and second components . . . ."

According to the Ebrahim reference:

Application No.: 10/659,133  
 Filing Date: September 10, 2003  
 Appellant(s): Per Hammarlund et al.  
 Reply Brief Filed: May 7, 2007

The access circuitry uses the first mode of operation for all access requests by the data processor coupled to the cache memory and for access requests by the system controller when the mode flag has a first value. It uses the second mode of operation for access requests by the system controller when the mode flag has a second value distinct from the first value.

Ebrahim at 4:33-39. This portion of Ebrahim makes it clear that the mode flag only affects the mode of the system controller, while the data processor always operates in the first mode.

Appellants' independent claim 2 states that "wherein access to the partitioned elements by said first and second components is controlled based on said first mask value." Emphases added.

On page 11 and 12 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner rehashes her argument about the UPANUM field teaching the first mask value of Appellants' claimed invention. Appellants' reiterate that the only description in the Ebrahim reference regarding the UPANUM field states that it "is a 5-bit mask field that specifies the maximum number of UPA ports the System Controller can support." Ebrahim 22:8-10. In both her Answer and the previous Office Actions, Examiner fails to explain how specifying the maximum number of UPA ports teaches "wherein access to the partitioned elements by said first and second components is controlled based on said first mask value."

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 2-11, 13, 18 and 20 should be reversed. Appellants therefore respectfully request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the Examiner's decision rejecting claims 2-11, 13, 18 and 20 and direct the Examiner to pass the case to issue.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be necessary for consideration of this paper to Kenyon & Kenyon LLP Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Application No.: 10/659,133  
Filing Date: September 10, 2003  
Appellant(s): Per Hammarlund et al.  
Reply Brief Filed: May 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: May 7, 2007

By:



Jeffrey R. Joseph  
(Reg. No. 54,204)  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600  
San Jose, CA 95110  
Telephone: (408) 975-7500  
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501